

REMARKS:

Claims 21,22, 27, 34, 39, 47, 48, 53, 54, 72:

The amendments set forth above are necessary to make it clear how the dependent claims are related to the newly amended independent claims by providing full antecedent basis. For example, in the prior response from applicant, the last step of the method of Claim 1 referred to a “correlation” step. As a result of the examiner’s amendment, the same step is now a “determination” step. Hence, the dependent claims that refer to a “correlation step” must now refer to the “determination step.”

Because the independent claims were allowed, and the amendments above are to the independent claims, no further search is required.

The amended claims are patentable because they are dependent on claims found allowable already pursuant to the Notice of Allowance dated December 27, 2006.

The amended claims were not presented earlier because the examiner entered the amendment.

Applicant requests that these amendments be entered pursuant to 37 CFR 1.312:

“Where claims added by amendment under 37 CFR 1.312 are all of the form of dependent claims, some of the usual reasons for non-entry are less likely to apply” MPEP §714.16(I).

Claim 63:

The correction repairs a typographic error that introduced an antecedence problem. This makes the claim “defined with sufficient clarity...” MPEP §714.16.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ted Sabety
Reg. No. 53,540

Date

Sabety +associates, PLLC
1500 Broadway, 12th fl.
New York, NY 10036